United Nations A/C.3/62/SR.34

General Assembly
Sixty-second session
Official Records

Distr.: General
10 December 2007
English
Original: French

Third Committee

Summary record of the 34th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 1 November 2007, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Wolfe ..... (Jamaica)

Contents

Agenda item 66: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

Agenda item 62: Social development (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

Agenda item 63: Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 66: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*)

Agenda item 106: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

Agenda item 107: International drug control (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

07-57609 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda item 66: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.24)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.24: Rights of the child

1. **Ms. Albuquerque** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union and the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, introduced draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.24 and said that the following countries had become sponsors: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Underlining the vital importance of the issue before the Committee, she noted that 2007 marked the eighteenth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the fifth anniversary of the entry into force of its two Optional Protocols. It was also the year of the mid-decade review of the follow-up to the special session of the General Assembly on children. The rights of children were being violated in all parts of the world, and the international community still had much more to do in order to ensure respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of children. The main challenges highlighted in the draft resolution had to do with registration of children and family relations, eradication of poverty, the right to education, the right to health and food, child labour, children living in difficult situations, children affected by armed conflict, child prostitution, child pornography and the sale of children. The draft resolution recommended that the Secretary-General should appoint a Special Representative on violence against children, whose mandate would be to promote the prevention and elimination of all forms of violence against children. All members of the Committee were encouraged to participate in drafting the final text of the resolution and to support it.

2. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Georgia, Guinea, Iceland, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Nigeria, Norway, San Marino, Senegal and Ukraine had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

Agenda item 62: Social development (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.6 and L.8)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.6: Cooperatives in social development

3. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

4. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) noted that Brazil, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Malawi, Mali, Myanmar and Panama had become sponsors at the time of introduction of the draft resolution and read out the revisions made to the text at that time by the main sponsor, Mongolia. The second preambular paragraph, as amended, would read: "*Recognizing* that cooperatives, in their various forms, promote the fullest possible participation in the economic and social development of all people, including women, youth, older people, people with disabilities and indigenous peoples; are becoming a major factor of economic and social development; and contribute to the eradication of poverty". A fourth preambular paragraph had been added, which read: "*Noting* with appreciation the potential role of cooperatives development in the improvement of social and economic conditions of the indigenous peoples and rural communities". In paragraph 2, in the third line, the words "and social" had been added after "business", and in the fourth line, "eradication of poverty" had been inserted after "sustainable development". In paragraph 3, in the fifth line, the words "and social" had been added between "business" and "enterprises". Subparagraph 4 (b) should read: "Encouraging and facilitating the establishment and development of cooperatives, including taking measures aimed at enabling people living in poverty or belonging to vulnerable groups, including women, youth, persons with disabilities, older persons and indigenous peoples, to fully participate, on a voluntary basis, in cooperatives and to address their social service needs". The last part of subparagraph 4 (c) should read: "... training, technical assistance and capacity-building of cooperatives, especially in fields of management, auditing and marketing skills". In subparagraph 4 (d), "and eradication of poverty" had been deleted from the English version. Subparagraph 4

(e) had been deleted. In paragraph 8, the words "Also requests" had been replaced by "Requests also" in the English version, and "through the Economic and Social Council" had been deleted.

5. **Mr. Sodnom** (Mongolia) said that Argentina, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Jamaica, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria and Thailand had become sponsors of the draft resolution, which he hoped would be adopted by consensus.

6. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Benin, Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Niger, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda and Zimbabwe had become sponsors of the draft resolution, as orally revised.

7. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.6, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.8: Follow-up to the tenth anniversary of the International Year of the Family and beyond

8. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

9. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that at the time of introduction of the draft resolution, Belarus, the Russian Federation and Uzbekistan had joined its sponsors.

10. **Mr. Hayee** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China and the sponsors of the resolution, read out revisions to the text. In the third line of paragraph 4, the words "within its mandate" had been added following "the United Nations Programme on the Family". In the fifth line, the words "to Governments, upon request," and the adjective "their" had been deleted. Adoption of the draft resolution would contribute significantly to the realization of the objectives of the tenth anniversary of the International Year of the Family and beyond.

11. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, Kazakhstan and the United States of America had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution as orally revised.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.8, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.*

13. **Ms. Glão** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union, explained her delegation's position, which was shared by Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Liechtenstein, Moldova, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey, and said that the European Union attached great importance to family-related issues. As early as 1989, the European Commission had published its first communiqué on family policies, which had been followed by important actions addressing such issues as parental leave, reconciling family and work life and improving the living conditions of vulnerable families. The European Union recognized the crucial role of parents, carers and families in improving outcomes for children and young people and the need to provide support for them to do so. It shared the view of many members of the Third Committee about the valuable contribution that families made to strengthening societies and the need to develop policies to support their role. The family was a dynamic, constantly changing entity whose diversity had to be recognized, as had been done at the various United Nations conferences and summits of the 1990s and in their follow-up process. Policy development should similarly reflect the diversity of family forms. The term "family" in the resolution reflected that diversity.

Agenda item 63: Advancement of women (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.15/Rev.1: Intensification of efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women

14. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

15. **Ms. Samson** (Netherlands) introduced the draft resolution, speaking also on behalf of France, which had introduced the original draft resolution, A/C.3/62/L.15, on 17 October 2007. She noted that Andorra, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Malawi, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had joined the sponsors. After summarizing the main provisions of the draft resolution, she pointed out that in paragraph 8 the words "activities related to" should be replaced by the word "on". Her delegation and that of France wished to

thank the members for their constructive participation in the consultations and were confident that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

16. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Azerbaijan, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Cambodia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Namibia, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

17. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.15/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.*

18. **Mr. Hagen** (United States of America) said that his country endorsed and reaffirmed the commitments and important political goals stated in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, on the understanding that they constituted an important policy framework that did not create international legal rights, including a right to abortion, or legally binding obligations on States under international law. References to the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, and their five-year and ten-year reviews, did not create any rights, and in particular did not create or recognize a right to abortion, and could not be interpreted to constitute support, endorsement or promotion of abortion. The United States supported the treatment of women who suffered injuries or illnesses caused by legal abortion, including post-abortion care, and did not consider such treatment to constitute abortion-related services.

19. **Mr. Suarez** (Colombia) said that, as usual, his delegation had sponsored the draft resolution. Colombia interpreted the reference to violence against indigenous women, in the fourth preambular paragraph, in the light of paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 61/143, referred to in the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. Colombia expressed its appreciation to all members concerning the adoption of that important draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.16: Eliminating the use of rape and other forms of sexual violence as instruments to achieve political or military objectives

20. **Mr. Hagen** (United States of America) requested that action on the draft resolution should be deferred.

21. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 66: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.22)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.22: World Autism Awareness Day

22. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

23. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that that, at the time of introduction of the draft resolution, Brazil, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Honduras, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Nicaragua and Uganda had joined its sponsors.

24. **Ms. Al-Thani** (Qatar) said that Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates had subsequently joined the sponsors. Her delegation was grateful to the numerous Member States that had supported that important draft resolution.

25. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) noted that Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lesotho, Mali, Myanmar, Niger, the Republic of Korea, Swaziland, Thailand, Timor-Leste and Viet Nam had also joined the sponsors.

26. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.22 was adopted without a vote.*

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.25)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.25: International Covenants on Human Rights

27. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

28. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) noted that, at the time of introduction of the draft resolution,

Angola, Benin, Cape Verde, the Dominican Republic, Greece, Lithuania, Montenegro, Nicaragua and Ukraine had become sponsors.

29. **Ms. Schlyter** (Sweden) speaking on behalf of the Nordic Group and the sponsors, said that the draft before the Committee was a biennial resolution relating to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights whose purpose, as in the past, was to underscore the importance of the States' accession to the Covenants as well as the two Optional Protocols to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the importance of implementation of those instruments. Her delegation attached great importance to the draft resolution and welcomed the fact that once again a large number of delegations had taken part in negotiations and many States had likewise decided to mark their support by becoming sponsors. She noted that since the introduction of the draft resolution Israel, Malta, Monaco and Uruguay had become sponsors. Malaysia had been included in the list of sponsors erroneously and she asked the Secretariat to delete its name. The text as submitted reflected the compromises agreed to by the sponsors and other delegations concerned, and her delegation hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

30. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Azerbaijan and Timor-Leste had become sponsors and that the Secretariat had taken due note of the request to remove Malaysia from the list of sponsors.

31. **Mr. Hagen** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution on the clear understanding that joining in the consensus did not imply that States not party to the instruments in question had any obligation to accede to them or be bound by their provisions. The United States of America naturally joined in the consensus that States must meet their obligations pursuant to instruments to which they were parties. The United States of America also reiterated its long-standing position that economic, social and cultural rights, which were to be progressively achieved in accordance with available resources, were not justificiable or enforceable in the same way as civil and political rights.

32. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.25 was adopted without a vote.*

Agenda item 106: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.11 and A/C.3/62/L.12/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.11: United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

33. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

34. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, at the time of introduction of the draft resolution, Belarus had become a sponsor.

35. **Mr. Babadoudou** (Benin), speaking on behalf of the African Group, apologized for the fact that the list of sponsors had not been submitted in time for delegations who wished to do so to become sponsors. He thanked all delegations that had participated in the consultations on the draft.

36. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Barbados, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lebanon, Nicaragua and Panama had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

37. **Mr. Babadoudou** (Benin) read out changes to the text of the draft resolution. New paragraph 2 would read: "*Commends also* the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) initiative in strengthening its working relationship with the United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders by supporting and involving the Institute in the implementation of a number of activities, including those contained in the Programme of Action, 2006-2010, on strengthening the rule of law and the criminal justice systems in Africa;". New paragraph 5 would read: "*Notes* a significant increase in the levels of payment of Member States' financial contributions to the Institute;". New paragraph 8 would read: "*Further urges* all States that have not already done so to consider ratifying or acceding to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime;".

38. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) noted that former paragraphs 5, 8 and 9 would be deleted.

39. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.11, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.12/Rev.1: Strengthening the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity

40. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) read out a statement of the programme budget implications of the draft resolution. With regard to paragraph 4 of the text, he noted that extrabudgetary funds in the amount of $38,400 had been made available for the provision of technical assistance in the form of either a national training course or support of a regional event and said that additional activities, including travel of participants, would be subject to the availability of additional extrabudgetary resources. With regard to paragraph 10, he said that implementation of the activities envisaged therein would likewise be subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources. Concerning regular budget resources, he noted that the amounts indicated in section 16 (International Drug Control, Crime and Terrorism Prevention, and Criminal Justice) of the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 reflected the establishment of one new post (P-3) in the Terrorism Prevention Branch, as indicated in paragraph 16.45 of document A/62/6 (sect. 16). As for operative paragraphs 12 and 13 of the text, the amount proposed in section 16 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 was $33,615,000 (at 2006-2007 rates), an increase of $776,600 or 2.4 per cent compared to the biennium 2006-2007. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.12/Rev.1 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

41. **The Chairman** drew the attention of the Committee to the provisions of part VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248B.

42. **Mr. Maestripieri** (Italy) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.12/Rev.1 and thanked the many delegations that had taken part in the three weeks of intensive and constructive consultations that had led to a consensus. He said that Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Lithuania, Malta, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Thailand, Ukraine and Viet Nam had become sponsors of the draft resolution subsequent to its introduction; he hoped other delegations would join them.

43. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Cameroon, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Iceland, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Philippines, Senegal, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Uganda, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan and Zambia had become sponsors.

44. **Mr. Cabello Guerra** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) expressed his delegation's concern that the thirteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution introduced a new concept in action to combat terrorism, according to which actions against transnational organized crime and terrorism were a common and shared responsibility. That principle had never before been invoked by the competent bodies. For example, the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy on the contrary was based on each States' obligations under international law. As formulated, the draft resolution therefore appeared to ignore the right of States to define their own priorities in the areas of security and defence in accordance with their domestic legal framework and international law.

45. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.*

Agenda item 107: International drug control (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.13/Rev.1: International cooperation against the world drug problem

46. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) read out a statement of programme budget implications of the draft resolution. Referring to paragraphs 3, 33 and 37, he said that the resources requested under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 in respect of section 16 (International drug control, crime and terrorism prevention and criminal justice) amounted to $33,615,000 (at 2006-2007 rates), representing an increase of $776,600 (2.4 per cent) relative to the biennium 2006-2007. In particular, it was planned to establish one post at the P-2 level in the secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board, as noted in paragraph 16.45 of document A/62/6 (Section 16). Implementation of the activities envisaged in paragraphs 27, 30, 36 and 41 of the draft resolution would entail the provision of technical assistance to be funded from extrabudgetary resources.

In that regard, it should be noted that in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 extrabudgetary resources had been projected at $290,160,000 for section 16, representing an increase of approximately $39.3 million relative to 2006-2007 [see A/62/6 (sect. 16), part IV]. Accordingly, adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.13/Rev.1 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for 2008-2009.

47. **Ms. Feller** (Mexico) introduced the draft resolution, noting that Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, India, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Morocco, Mauritius, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Niger, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Ukraine, Thailand, the United States of America and Viet Nam had also joined the sponsors. Her delegation welcomed the success of the informal consultations that it had held and had no doubt that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

48. After noting the main provisions of the draft resolution, she pointed out that the third line of paragraph 33 should be revised to read "encourages it to carry out its work in accordance with its mandate". In paragraph 34, the words "regional intergovernmental organizations" should be replaced by "intergovernmental, international, and regional organizations" and the words "as appropriate", followed by a comma, should be inserted after the words "drug control mandates".

49. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Benin, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Djibouti, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Iceland, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Swaziland, Timor-Leste, Togo and Uganda had also joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.13/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.*

51. **Mr. Rogachev** (Russian Federation), explaining the position of his delegation with regard to draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.13/Rev.1, said that the Russian Federation, a traditional sponsor of resolutions on international cooperation against the world drug problem, had not wished to break consensus. However, it was concerned that the resolution contained no provisions reflecting the threat of the spread of opiates originating in Afghanistan, and it had therefore been obliged to abandon its sponsorship. The Russian Federation had always been deeply committed to widening international cooperation in anti-drug action and attached particular importance to strengthening United Nations activities in that area. It was in favour of a balanced and constructive approach that made it possible to take into account the various delegations' interests while focusing the action of the international community on key issues of the anti-drug effort. As one such issue in recent years had been, precisely, the illegal cultivation of the opium poppy and the production and trafficking of narcotics from Afghanistan, in preceding resolutions that question had been referred to specifically in both the preambular and the operative part of the resolution. The purpose of those references had not in any way been to single out Afghanistan or to criticize the efforts made by the Government of that country to combat drugs, but, on the contrary, to encourage States to strengthen international and regional cooperation in order to support the efforts of the Afghan Government to address the threat to the international community represented by the increasing illegal production and circulation of Afghan opium derivatives. That approach had made it possible to keep the problem of drugs from Afghanistan as a central focus of the global anti-drug agenda and to garner the necessary support on the part of the various international and regional programmes, including those carried out under the aegis of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. The deletion of the paragraphs on Afghanistan was a marked change from the procedure that had been followed to date, and one that was especially puzzling at the present time, when the general situation relating to Afghan drugs was continuing to deteriorate. Afghanistan now essentially held the monopoly of opium derivatives on the world market. The omission of those paragraphs had the effect of weakening the common international efforts to put an end to a major transboundary threat related to the illegal production and spread of Afghan drugs.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.